## **REMARKS**

5

10

15

20

25

30

35

40

45

50

55

The Examiner's allowance of Claims 1, 3-19, and 21-23 is acknowledged and appreciated.

In this First Amendment to the Application, no amendments have been made to distinguish over the prior art cited by either the Applicants in their specification, or the Examiner in the Office Action of November 20, 1997. Indeed, all Claims except Claims 2 and 20 have been allowed. Claim 2 was objected to for informalities, and Claim 20 was rejected because of insufficient antecedent basis. Thus, no amendments were required to further distinguish over the prior art.

The Examiner objected to the disclosure because of the use of the article "a" on page 3, line 41. The article has been deleted by amendment, and the Examiner's objection has been overcome.

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. More particularly, the Examiner states that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations "said video signal data rate" in lines 32 and 33, "said video signal resolution" in line 36, and "said video image information" in line 37.

Claim 20 has been amended to refer to the limitations "a video signal data rate", "a video signal resolution", and "said video image" to establish a sufficient antecedent basis and overcome the Examiner's rejection. In addition, Claim 20 has been amended to delete redundant language in the preamble, and to correct two typing errors by eliminating the word "and" at the end of line 39, and changing a semi-colon to a comma in line 40.

In view of the above explanation and amendment, the Examiner's rejection of Claim 20 is believed overcome, and Claim 20 is now believed to be in condition for allowance.

The Examiner further objected to Claim 2 because of the use of a repetition of the phrase "said microprocessor means" in line 32 on page 33 of the specification. Accordingly, Claim 2 has been amended to delete the repeated phrase, and add in its place "said frame buffer input control means". Support for this addition is found in Figure 1, and page 7 of the specification.

The "color to monochrome reduction means" element of Claim 2 also has been amended to more clearly indicate that a color to monochrome reduction is required only when a color video signal is to be displayed on a monochrome flat panel display, and that a monochrome video signal is merely passed through the reduction means without a reduction occurring. Support for these amendments may be found at lines 29-31 of page 6, lines 46-53 of page 7, and lines 5-6 of page 8 of the specification.

Other amendments have been made to Claim 2 to more clearly define the invention, remove ambiguities in antecedent basis, and provide a further electrical communication between Claim elements which was inadvertently left out but stands supported by Figure 1 and pages 9 and 10 of the specification. Thus, the limitation "said frame buffer means" has been added to line 37 on page 33 of Claim 2.

In view of the above amendments, the Examiner's objection against Claim 2 is believed overcome, and the Claim is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-23 also have been carefully reviewed and amended to correct misspellings and typographical errors, and to be in clear conformity with the specification. Claim 1 was amended to indicate that when the received video signal is a color signal and the flat panel display is a monochrome

display, the color signal is digitized and reduced to a monochrome display image. Otherwise, digitized video signals are passed through the color reduction means without reduction. Support for this amendment may be found at page 7 of the specification, lines 47-53; page 8 of the specification, lines 1-10; page 23 of the specification, lines 25-52; and page 24 of the specification, lines 5-7. Claim 1 was further amended to indicate that video signals may be received at the data rate of the video source, and asynchronously supplied to the flat panel display at the data rate dictated by the flat panel display. Support for this amendment may be found at page 3 of the specification, lines 27-28; page 28 of the specification, lines 50-53; page 29 of the specification, lines 5-8; and Claim 2 on page 33 at lines 5-8.

Further, dependent Claims 24 and 25 were added to include limitations disclosed by the specification, but not otherwise addressed in the Claims. Claim 26 complements Claim 1 in that Claim 26 more dramatically emphasizes the ability to receive video data at one rate dictated by the video source, and asynchronously provide display image data at a second rate dictated by the flat panel display. Claim 27 was added to include a method Claim counterpart to the apparatus Claims covering the entire electronic control system of the invention. Dependent Claims 28-36 add limitations to the method Claim 27 which are set forth in the specification.

In accordance with the Examiner's request, new application papers with lines double spaced on good quality paper are enclosed.

The specification has been reviewed, and minor errors have been corrected by amendment.

The Examiner further has stated that a new title of the invention is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Accordingly, the title has been amended to become, "Automated Flat Panel Display Control System For Accommodating Broad Range Of Video Types And Formats". In view of the above amendment to the title, the Examiner's objection is believed to be overcome.

The Notice Of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review is acknowledged, and formal drawings addressing each of the Draftsperson's objections are enclosed. The Draftsperson's objections thus are believed to be overcome.

All objections and rejections are believed to have been successfully overcome, and early Notice Of Allowance And Issue Fee Due is requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Gerald E Lester

Law Offices Of Gerald E. Lester

22107 Fielder Katy, Texas 77450

Reg. No. 27,697

Ph. (281) 392-8288 Fx. (281) 392-2850

50

10

15

20

25

30

35

40

45

55